

**United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 99-1937

---

Kenneth W. McClendon; Babatunde	*	
Deinbo; Louis Bowser; Nina Schaefer;	*	
Janet Kreutz; Lorraine Batton; Margie	*	
Batton; Martha Beamon; Jean	*	
Blaylock; Matt Brown; Irene Calton;	*	
Geraldine Cardinale; Sam Cardinale;	*	
Manuel Chatman; Willie Clay; Dion	*	
Coleman; Richard Cottrill; Deann	*	
Deimeke; Leon Deimeke; Debra Dill;	*	
Harry Doepke; Lila Doepke; Edwin	*	
Doering; Joyce Doering; Kathi Flynn;	*	
Martin Flynn; Gene Foster; Pat Foster;	*	
Imogene Freeman; William Freeman;	*	
Charles Gholson; Ursula Gholson;	*	Appeal from the United States
Sylvester Harris; Rochelle Hill; James	*	District Court for the
Hudspeth; Norma Hudspeth;	*	Eastern District of Missouri.
Artimese Johnson; Manuel Levin;	*	
Elmo Martin; Vesta Martin; Clyde	*	[UNPUBLISHED]
McDuffie; August Menk; Florence	*	
Menk; Ralph Monteleone; Margaret	*	
Monteleone; Mary Moran; Mabel	*	
Peters; Ray L. Raymer; Floyd Roark;	*	
Thelma Robinson; Doris Sackson;	*	
Reverlea Stafford; Betty Stallings;	*	
John Stein; Gene Taylor; Mary Taylor;	*	
Dorothy Thornton; John Doe; Jane	*	
Doe, all residents of the City of	*	
Berkeley, and all others similarly	*	
situated,	*	
	*	
Appellants,	*	



Before WOLLMAN, Chief Judge, BOWMAN, and MORRIS SHEPPARD ARNOLD,  
Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Kenneth McClendon and sixty other named plaintiffs brought this action against the City of Berkeley, Missouri, its mayor, and various of its other present and former officials. Their complaint raises a variety of claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on alleged violations of their constitutional rights in addition to claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3) for allegedly conspiring to violate certain constitutional rights. McClendon also asserts a pendent state-law claim sounding in false arrest and malicious prosecution. In general, the claims all arise from alleged political misconduct by city officials. The District Court<sup>1</sup> granted individual Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) motions to dismiss filed by all defendants. The court also denied leave to plaintiffs to file an amended complaint. Plaintiffs appeal, contesting these rulings.

Having carefully considered the case, we conclude the District Court did not err in dismissing as to all defendants on the ground that the complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Similarly, we conclude the court did not abuse its discretion by denying plaintiffs' motion to file an amended complaint. See Bell v. Allstate Life Ins. Co., 160 F.3d 452, 454 (8th Cir. 1998) (stating standard of review). Inasmuch as an opinion in this meritless appeal would involve only a restatement of well-settled rules of law and their straightforward application to the allegations of the complaint, an exercise already thoroughly and competently performed by the District Court, we affirm the rulings of that court without further discussion.

AFFIRMED. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Stephen Limbaugh, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.